

**City of Madison  
Economic Development Commission  
Subcommittee on 3-5 Year Strategic Economic  
Development Implementation Plan**

**MINUTES - DRAFT**

Wednesday, May 14, 2008 5:00 pm

Madison Municipal Building  
Room 101 (Transportation)

**CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

**The meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM**

Subcommittee members Present: Mr. Clarke, Ms. Gleason, Ms. Selkove, Mr. Sloan

Subcommittee members absent: None

Also Present: Alder Brandon, Alder Clear, Alder Konkell, Mr. Rick Richards, Mr. Mikolajewski

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 28, 2008, MEETING**

**Ms. Selkove moved, seconded by Mr. Clarke, to approve the minutes of the April 28 meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.**

**1: 09033: 3-5 Year Strategic Economic Development Implementation Plan**

*Discussion and editing of the March 28,2008 draft plan:*

Alder Brandon suggested that the EDC minimize the number of changes that it makes to the draft plan. The EDC was charged, via the budget, to have an outside professional prepare the plan. Significant changes to the plan, on the part of the EDC, could be viewed as a deviation from the budget item.

Mr. Clarke stated that given the comments that have been received to date, there are changes that must be made. Otherwise, discussion will be focused on formatting problems, rather than substantive recommendations.

Mr. Sloan expressed concern that the document reviews workforce, unemployment, and poverty rate at an aggregate level. Closer examination should be given to areas of the City with particularly high unemployment.

Ms. Selkove noted that at their previous meeting, the Sub-Committee discussed a fairly significant rewrite of the document, including both substantive and formatting

changes. Ms. Selkove was concerned that we were setting a precedent for utilizing staff time when we are not satisfied with the work of a consultant.

Alder Brandon noted that just because something isn't written into the economic plan doesn't mean that the City can't do it. The City requested an outside consultant to provide recommendations regarding what he thinks we should do. That does not say that the City can't augment that policy. Alder Brandon expressed concern that changing the plan now will invite others to do the same.

Ms. Gleason noted that the primary purpose of additional EDC/staff work on the plan is to reformat and rearrange the document. At the end of the day, it is the intent of the EDC to have a product that they can feel comfortable with.

Alder Brandon reminded the EDC about the problem of noting omissions in one area, but not another. There was reason the City selected a consultant for the project, and he is okay with being firm with the consultant.

Mr. Mikolajewski was asked about the work that staff had done on the project since receiving a draft of the document. Mr. Mikolajewski replied that staff had prepared an alternative layout for the entire document, an alternative manner for displaying the recommendations, considered changes to the order of sections within the document, prepared a section documenting the work completed by Mr. Ticknor, and started to consider alternative vision language.

Mr. Clarke noted that he would not be comfortable forwarding the plan on in its current state.

Mr. Brandon suggested that the City thank Mr. Ticknor for his recommendation, and move on. The EDC knows what Mr. Ticknor recommends, and the EDC can make a determination about what it would like to recommend.

Mr. Clarke noted that there is a lot of good content found within the document. Of primary concern is formatting, which Mr. Clarke believes can be done in a better way.

Mr. Sloan suggested that the EDC forward Mr. Ticknor a list of ideas/recommendations for him to consider and/or change.

Ms. Selkove suggested that the EDC almost needs a separate document - their own list of next steps for the Council.

Ms. Gleason recognized that two discussions were occurring simultaneously regarding the document. The first involves how the document looks and flows. The second is regarding whether or not substantive changes should be made to the report.

Mr. Clarke reminded the EDC that much of the conversation at their last meeting was not about modifying the report. A lot of people brought forth good ideas

throughout the process, and Mr. Clarke believes it is important that the EDC acknowledge that it heard them.

Mr. Sloan suggested that the EDC recognize that here is the plan, and then here are some other issues that need to be addressed.

Mr. Clarke noted that the way the EDC discusses the plan is important as much of the plan is about systems, structures, and procedures. Much of the effort of the plan is about setting the groundwork.

Alder Brandon noted that the City received a 3-5 Year Strategic Economic Development Implementation Plan. If the City desires a greater Madison vision, it is will cost a lot more than the \$50,000 budget for this project.

Ms. Gleason noted that it was not the desire of the City to receive a document that sat on a shelf. The EDC wanted implementation language instead of another 25-year plan.

Ms. Selkove noted that the City needs additional justification language for the recommendations provided.

Mr. Sloan suggested that the City go back to Mr. Ticknor with its formatting concerns ... how it looks and flows.

Alder Brandon stated that he is okay with staff making some formatting changes, but that Mr. Ticknor should be making substantive changes to the document. Alder Brandon noted that the plan is just a plan until components of it become law.

Alder Clear noted that items to be budgeted must come out of a concrete strategy. If the Ticknor document does not have it all, does the City want one that does?

Alder Brandon noted that the EDC could create a work plan. It might be better to handle in a separate document.

Alder Konkell recognized that a scatter-shot approach does not work, if it doesn't link back to something. It takes time to develop, but if economic development is important, than the City should spend the time. At some point, the City needs a strategy.

Ms. Gleason recognizes that we need closure to the contract between the City and Mr. Ticknor.

Mr. Clarke suggested that staff work with Mr. Ticknor to reformat the plan, and that he is fine with making substantive changes as well.

Ms. Selkove noted that additional detail regarding a vision statement could occur in a separate document.

Mr. Sloan noted that Mr. Ticknor's report is one tool; it is not the end-all, be-all.

**The Sub-Committee directed staff to request Mr. Ticknor to complete the three items that they requested at their last meeting, and in addition, to provide additional rationale behind each recommendation, especially when the rationale is not immediately apparent. The Sub-Committee wanted Mr. Ticknor's signature on these substantive changes.**

**Staff was directed to work on reformatting the document as discussed by the EDC, incorporating the additional language requested of Mr. Ticknor. This revised draft will be presented to the EDC at their June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

Ms. Gleason questioned whether or not the Sub-Committee was still interested in a joint work session between the EDC and Council regarding the economic development plan. The Sub-Committee indicated that they would be interested in this.

Mr. Brandon noted that he would follow-up accordingly with the Council President to schedule a joint work session, likely during the Week of June 16<sup>th</sup>.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Clarke moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Sloan. The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.**